

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: 5:23-CV-00964-SB-E

Date: August 16, 2024

Title: Bernadine Griffith v. TikTok, Inc. et al.

Present: The Honorable **STANLEY BLUMENFELD, JR., U.S. District Judge**

Lynnie Fahey

CourtSmart

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

Ekwan E. Rhow

Victor H. Jih

Jonathan M Rotter

Luis Li

Jumin Lee

Eric Thomas Kohan

Marc E Masters

Yoonhee Gloria Park

Proceedings: (Minutes of) Motion for Class Certification [177] (Held and completed)

Case called and appearances made. The Court heard argument from counsel on its tentative ruling on Plaintiffs' motion for class certification (Dkt. No. 177). The Court took the matter under submission.

In its tentative, the Court had stated:

The Court granted Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' unjust enrichment claim in their FAC, explaining that there is no independent cause of action for unjust enrichment under California law. Dkt. No. 81 at 11. It is unclear why Plaintiffs realleged this claim in their SAC. Plaintiffs should explain at the hearing why their claim for unjust enrichment should not be dismissed based on the

Court's prior order. Failure to do so will be construed as consent to dismiss that claim.

Plaintiffs did not make any argument against dismissal of the unjust enrichment claim, even after the Court raised this issue. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' unjust enrichment claim is dismissed.

0:58